

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action dated June 11, 2008. Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly and completely recite the novel features of the invention within the independent claims. No new matter has been added, and the amendments place the claims in better condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the claims. The discussion/arguments provided below reference the claims in their amended form.

Applicants are not conceding in this application that those originally presented claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these original claims and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the present Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 7-9 and 21-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wang* (U.S. Patent No. 5,187,769) in view of *Matsuo et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,301). Further, Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wang and Matsuo* in view of *Golliver et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. US2002/0004809). The limitations of the various references were described in detail in the Appeal Brief and previously-filed Amendments. Those arguments, where applicable, are incorporated herein by reference. In particular, Applicants reiterate that *Matsuo* does not teach or suggest a pair of three input arithmetic units, which receive three operands (at the same time) from two register files. *Matsuo* merely provides a 3-operand instruction, which does not simultaneously provide three operands to a single 3-input arithmetic unit or for that matter to two such arithmetic units.

Also, Applicants have amended the claims to now provide a clearer description of the novel features of the invention. The amendments provide features within the claims that traverse the rejections as well as the rebuttal arguments proffered by Examiner in the Examiner's Response section of the Office Action (page 13-15). For example, Applicants' claims now clarify and/or more clearly recites that the vector unit has three inputs and receives three operands at the same time. These features are not taught nor suggested by the references or combination thereof. The failure of the references to teach or suggest these features is clearly

established by Examiner's within the Examiner's Response section of the Office Action. Given that Examiner has already admitted to these shortcomings within the references, the present claim amendments necessarily overcome the present rejection. Applicants' claims are therefore allowable over the combination of references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by amending the claims to more clearly and completely recite the novel features of the invention within the independent claims. Applicants have also provided discussion/arguments which explain why Applicants' claims are not suggested by the references or combinations thereof. The arguments overcome the §103 rejections, and Applicants respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all claims now pending.

Applicants further invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney of record at 512.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Eustace P. Isidore
Reg. No. 56,104
Dillon & Yudell LLP
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)